

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

8 JEROME CEASAR ALVERTO,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 CHRISTOPHER SCHENK, *et al.*,

12 Defendants.

Case No. 18-1381-JCC-MLP

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO EXTEND DISCOVERY
DEADLINE

13
14 This matter comes before the Court upon Plaintiff's motion for a third extension of the
15 discovery deadline in this case. (Dkt. # 61.) By Order dated October 3, 2019, the Court recently
16 denied Plaintiff's motion to compel Defendants to produce certain documents in response to
17 Plaintiff's requests for production, but granted Plaintiff a thirty-day extension of time to reply to
18 Defendants' motion for summary judgment. (Dkt. # 60.) On the same day the Court denied
19 Plaintiff's motion, Plaintiff moved for an extension of the August 30, 2019 discovery deadline
20 "to allow him opportunity to receive" the requested documents. (Dkt. # 61 at 1-2.)

21 Plaintiff claims he initially submitted two requests for production to Defendants before
22 the discovery deadline passed, and that Defendants improperly refused to produce the materials.
23 (*Id.*) First, Plaintiff argues that Defendants should have provided him with a copy of his own

1 deposition transcript. (*Id.* at 2.) However, Plaintiff has cited no authority, and the Court is aware
2 of none, holding that prisoners are entitled to free copies of their deposition transcripts.
3 Defendants are under no obligation to order and pay for a certified copy of the deposition
4 transcript for Plaintiff's use in this litigation, as Plaintiff's IFP status does not relieve him of his
5 obligation to finance his own litigation expenses.

6 Second, Plaintiff argues that the Defendants erroneously failed to provide him with a
7 copy of a kiosk e-mail grievance Plaintiff allegedly sent to Defendant Maxson on December 20,
8 2018. (*Id.*) Defendants responded to Plaintiff's request for production by explaining that they did
9 attempt to locate this message, but "no kiosk message dated December 20, 2018 from Plaintiff to
10 Defendant Maxson was located." (*Id.* at 13 (Defendants' response to Plaintiff's RFP).) It
11 appears that Defendants did provide Plaintiff with a copy of the kiosk messages exchanged
12 between Defendant Maxson and Plaintiff around the same time period. (*Id.*)

13 Accordingly, Plaintiff has not shown good cause for the Court to reopen discovery in this
14 case, and Plaintiff's motion for extension of the discovery deadline (dkt. # 61) is DENIED. As
15 discussed in the Court's October 3, 2019 Order, the discovery cutoff was initially set for March
16 18, 2019, approximately seven months ago. (Dkt. # 60 at 2.) No further extensions of the
17 discovery deadline will be granted in this matter. Plaintiff's reply to Defendants' motion for
18 summary judgment is due by no later than **November 4, 2019**.

19 The Clerk is directed to send copies of this order to the parties and to the Honorable John
20 C. Coughenour.

21 Dated this 7th day of October, 2019.

22 

23 MICHELLE L. PETERSON
United States Magistrate Judge